



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,068	08/20/2003	Hisashi Nakamura	031016	4352

38834 7590 12/08/2009

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP  
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW  
SUITE 700  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

XIAO, KE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/08/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentmail@whda.com

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/644,068

**Applicant(s)**

NAKAMURA ET AL.

**Examiner**

Ke Xiao

**Art Unit**

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/22)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 3 and 4** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizoguchi (US 5,841,466) in view of Iwasa (WO 02/42890) and Okamoto (US 5,465,083).

Regarding **Claims 3 and 4**, Mizoguchi teaches a liquid crystal projector system for regulating use of a liquid crystal projector (Mizoguchi, Fig. 2 element 5), comprising:

an external computer for operating the liquid crystal projector, the external computer being connected to the liquid crystal projector by radio or wire and including liquid crystal projector controlling software for controlling the liquid crystal projector (Mizoguchi, Fig. 3 element 8 and 22);

the liquid crystal projector comprising:

an operation unit for operating the liquid crystal projector, the operation means including means for entering a command to control the liquid crystal project via key entry (Mizoguchi, Fig. 2 element 14, Fig. 4 elements 30-32);

a circuit for registering a password in the liquid crystal projector  
(Mizoguchi, Fig. 4 element 30);

a determining unit to determining whether a password is registered in the liquid crystal projector in response to a power supply of the liquid crystal projector being turned on (Mizoguchi, Fig. 1 element S3, Fig. 4 element 30);

a circuit for inhibiting operation of the liquid crystal projector by the operation means, as well as for waiting until a password is received from the external computer in response to detecting that the password is registered in the liquid crystal projector (Mizoguchi, Fig. 1 S14-S17, Fig. 4 elements 3, 5 and 30);

a circuit for comparing, in response to receiving the password from the external computer, the received password with the registered password and for allowing operating of the liquid crystal projector by the external computer in response to the means for comparing indicating that both the registered password and the password received from the external computer coincide with each other (Mizoguchi, Fig. 1 S14-S17, Fig. 4 elements 3, 5 and 30); and

a power off operation of the liquid crystal projector wherein the operation of the power key provided in the operation means is never nullified or inhibited (Mizoguchi, Figs. 2 and 4 element 12, the power key is separate from the actual control device it's a hardwire switch which provides power to the entire device thereby it is not nullified by the password system).

Mizoguchi fails to teach a determining circuit to determine a number of times an erroneous password is entered and nullifying operation of keys of the operation unit as claimed.

Iwasa teaches determining a number of times an erroneous password is entered and to inhibit operation of an electronic system in response to determining that the number of times an erroneous password is entered exceeds a predetermined number of times (Iwasa, Fig. 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add an additional circuit to determine a number of times an erroneous password is entered and to inhibit operation of the display of Mizoguchi in response to determining that the number of times an erroneous password is entered exceeds a predetermined number of times as taught by Iwasa in order to prevent an unauthorized user from guessing at the password repeatedly.

Mizoguchi in view of Iwasa fails to teach nullifying operation of keys of the operation means when the passwords coincide with each other as claimed.

Okamoto teaches nullifying operation of keys of the operation means when the passwords coincide with each other in order to establish a key lock mode (Okamoto, Claim 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the key lock mode to nullify operation of the keys for inputting additional passwords as taught by Okamoto to the password input system of Mizoguchi in view of Iwasa in order to prevent erroneous entering of false passwords after the correct password has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed August 10<sup>th</sup> 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant makes the following arguments:

1) Okamoto's invention is designed to nullify inputs from the operation means which when combined with Mizoguchi would teach "the operation means (the remote controller 3, 5) of the optical visual apparatus based on a password entered by the operation means of the optical visualizing apparatus" which would not resent in the present invention. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

Okamoto clearly teaches the inhibition of the input device that is used to input the password, which is for locking the input in order to prevent erroneous inputs, this erroneous input isn't limited to other users but any user including the current user, the intended use of the system is to lock the input device so that no erroneous inputs are made. As such it is reasonable to add such a system to Mizoguchi, and such a combined system would satisfied the claim limitations because the inhibited device would be the keypad of Mizoguchi which is also used for password input.

2) Okamoto teaches several different modes including "if the password entered at this time matches the previously registered password, the system maintains the key lock state." (col. 10 lines 58-65) The examiner would like to note that this is the exact limitation of the claim language, where if the password is entered that matches a

previously registered password the keyboard is inhibited. The system of Okamoto states that this is to prevent erroneous input and is therefore a proper combination with Mizoguchi. The claim fails to recite that the input of the password has to allow access to the LCD as well as inhibit the keyboard *at the same time* which means that the password entered can be at separate times in order to both unlock the LCD as well as inhibit keyboard input, said combination would satisfy the claim language.

3) Okamoto is unrelated to LCD projectors, and Mizoguchi and Isawa both fail to disclose nullifying operation of keys of an operation unit of a LCD projector in response to a registered password, the combination is therefore improper since they are in not in related fields. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Okamoto is merely a teaching a further layer of protection for a computer system which includes the use of password locking a input device which can be used in the system of Mizoguchi and Isawa. Just because Mizoguchi and Isawa teach allowing keyboard entry does not mean inhibiting keyboard entry is prohibited. Okamoto teaches locking the keyboard in order to prevent erroneous inputs which is a reasonable addition to the input systems of Mizoguchi and Isawa in order to provide better security.

For the above reasons the rejections of claims 3 and 4 are maintained.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ke Xiao whose telephone number is (571)272-7776. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on (571) 272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sumati Lefkowitz/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Ke Xiao/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2629